

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed April 15, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,039,611 to Yang in view of Japanese Publication No. 06-231836 to Yoshihito et al. The Examiner further indicated that claim 23 was allowed. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-15 and 17-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang in view of Yoshihito et al. Because the combination of Yang and Yoshihito et al. does not recite each and every element set forth in claims 1-15 and 17-22, claims 1-15 and 17-22 are not obvious in view of the combination of Yang and Yoshihito et al.

With regard to independent claims 1, 9, 15 and 21, the Examiner stated that “Yang doesn’t show the cavity between the front and rear sides and the tail of each of the terminals extending out of the rear side of the connector body.” The Examiner then claims that it would have been obvious to modify the connector of Yang by including the cavity between the front and rear sides. However, the Examiner does *not* discuss the terminals of Yoshihito. The terminals of Yoshihito et al. do not appear to have tails which extend out of the rear side of the connector body.

The terminals (10) of Yoshihito et al. do not appear to have tails which extend out of the rear side of the connector body (20) because it appears from FIG. 2 of Yoshihito et al. that, in the combination of the holder (30), the holder guide (40), and element (50), the holder (30) and the cable end part (50a) extend between the hold pins (60), such that the holder (30) and the cable end part (50a) would be inserted into the rear side of the element (20). As the holder (30) and the cable end part (50a) extend into the cavity of the element (20), the terminals (10) would not be extending out of the rear side of the element (20) because there would be no where for the terminals (10) to extend. It further cannot be said that the holder guide (40) is adapted to support the tail of each of the terminals (10).

Thus, as neither of the references cited by the Examiner, namely Yang and Yoshihito et al., disclose, teach or suggest that the tails of the terminals thereof extend out of the rear side of the connector body, the combination of the two references cannot be said to provide for the claim limitation of claims 1, 9, 15 and 21 of “the terminals each having a tail extended out of said rear side of the connector body”. Therefore, it cannot be said that claims 1, 9, 15 and 21 are unpatentable in

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

view of the two prior art references. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 9, 15 and 21.

Claims 2-8 and 22 are dependent upon claim 1 which applicant submits is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-8 and 22 are respectfully requested.

Claims 10-14 are dependent upon claim 9 which applicant submits is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 10-14 is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-20 are dependent upon claim 15 which applicant submits is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 17-20 is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections in light of the above remarks, and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conversation will facilitate the prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

MOLEX INCORPORATED

Date:

June 13, 2003

By:

Robert J. Zeitler

Robert J. Zeitler
Registration No. 37,973
Attorney of Record

Mailing Address:

Robert J. Zeitler
MOLEX INCORPORATED
2222 Wellington Court
Lisle, Illinois 60532
Tel.: (630) 527-4884
Fax.: (630) 416-4962

BEST AVAILABLE COPY